

#### State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations

#### **DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Shepard Building 255 Westminster Street Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400 Enclosure 6a4 January 14, 2019

January 29, 2019

**TO:** Members of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education

**FROM:** Ken Wagner, Ph.D., Commissioner

RE: Approval of The Hope Academy Charter Renewal

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT, the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to renew the charter of The Hope Academy for 5 years, with sustainability conditions, for the term beginning with school year 2019-20 expiring at the end of school year 2023-24.

#### **Enclosed Documents:**

The following documents provide further detail regarding the Commissioner's recommendation and analysis contributing to that recommendation:

- <u>Commissioner's Recommendation Overview</u>: including an overview of the charter.
- <u>RIDE's Renewal Report</u>: containing detailed information regarding the performance of the charter and findings as a result of the renewal site visit.
- <u>Charter's Response</u>: including additional information and context provided independently by the charter in regards to the renewal recommendation and report.
- <u>Annual Performance Dashboards</u>: containing detail on performance ratings for each school and each year of the charter's term.



### The Hope Academy

### Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation Recommendation: 5-Year Renewal, with Sustainability Conditions

#### **Renewal Recommendation Overview:**

	Summary of Recommendation			
Recommended Action:	The Commissioner recommends that the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to <u>renew</u> the charter of The Hope Academy for <u>5 years</u> , with sustainability conditions			
Recommended Charter Term:	From SY2019-20 through SY2023-24			
Recommended	The sustainability conditions address the charter's specific deficiencies found during the renewal process. The Commissioner, with the advice and consent of the Council, reserves the authority to take action, as outlined in the charter school regulations section 2.5 (200-RICR-20-05-2.2.5), should the charter not meet the expectations of the required renewal conditions.			
Sustainability Conditions:	<ol> <li>Prior to the 2019 lottery, The Hope Academy must demonstrate implementation of its recruitment policy to ensure efforts reach prospective students and families across both sending districts.</li> </ol>			
	2. By June 1, 2019, The Hope Academy must implement a plan to ensure recruitment efforts are reviewed and changed as needed each year.			
	The 2017-18 school year is the first year academic performance could be evaluated since it was the first year the school had tested grades for the state assessment. The school received a 3-star rating on the statewide accountability system meeting expectations for School Performance.			
	• For achievement, the school earned 2 points (out of 4) for both Math (22% proficient) and ELA (47% proficient).			
Recommendation	The growth measure in the statewide accountability system could not be calculated, since 17-18 was the first year with tested students.			
Key Points:	The school did not have enough EL students to calculate the EL progress measure in the statewide accountability system.			
	Hope Academy approached expectations for Organizational Criterion 2.3, Equity and Access. This resulted in an overall "approaches expectations" rating for Organizational performance.			
	Despite having a recruitment policy, the school did not actively recruit students, most notably from North Providence. The school's most recent applicant pool consisted of a handful of North Providence residents compared to over 130 Providence applicants.			

#### **Charter Overview:**

Current Charter Overview				
Charter Type	Mayoral	2017-18 Grades Served	K-3	
School-Year Opened	2014-15	2017-18 Enrollment	143	
Current Charter Term	2014/15 - 2018/19	Authorized Enrollment	324 (grades K-8)	
Enrolling Communities	North Providence, Providence	Location(s)	Providence	



### The Hope Academy Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation Recommendation: 5-Year Renewal, with Sustainability Conditions

	School Mission and Model		
School Mission:	The mission of The Hope Academy is to commit "to an educational model focusing on the academic and social success of each individual, preparing students to meet the challenges of secondary education and to become lifelong learners. Working with parents and community partners, The Hope Academy will serve as a local and national replicable model of inclusive education."		
School Model:	The Hope Academy is a Mayoral academy co-located with Meeting Street. The Hope Academy focuses on fully inclusive classrooms and combines individualized instruction and co-teaching.  The Hope Academy's philosophy of teaching, learning, and administration are based on creating a positive learning environment where each student is supported in their development of academic and social skills. The Hope Academy intends to serve as a replicable model for other schools and districts to provide an inclusive educational program.		

#### **Overview of Charter Performance Ratings:**

The following table depicts the charter's performance according to the Charter Performance Review System. For more detail on performance ratings, please see the charter's renewal report and annual performance dashboards.

	The Hope Academy				
	Indicators	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Academic	(1A) School Performance	NR	NR	NR	M
Acad	(1B) School Comparison	-	NR	NR	NR
oility	(1) Financial	-	M	М	M
Sustainability	(2) Organizational	-	M	М	A
Sust	(3) Compliance	-	M	М	M
	Renewal Process Tier		No Tier. In-Depth R	enewal Process	
Updated Tier Designation			Tier 3 (Organ	izational)	

Ratings Key				
Е	Exceeds Expectations	DNM	Does Not Meet Expectations	
М	Meets Expectations	NR	Not Rated	
Α	Approaches Expectations	NA	Not Applicable	



#### **ABOUT THIS REPORT**

In 2015, RIDE embarked on a process to revise the existing charter performance framework based on lessons learned over 5 years of implementation and alignment to national best practice. The updated <u>Charter School Performance Review System</u> was created in collaboration with a committee of charter school practitioners and the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. The purpose of the revision was to increase transparency of charter performance review, provide clarity on charter's performance annually, and ensure consistency of decisions that prioritize the school's academic performance. The 2016-17 school year was the first year of implementation, and all charter schools received 2015-16 performance ratings applied retroactively to initiate the new performance framework.

This report comprises performance ratings for the previous three years of the charter's term (2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18). The 2014-15 school year, the first year of the current charter term, is not rated due to the transition of both the charter performance review system and the statewide assessment. Performance ratings utilize data from school-generated annual reports and other RIDE monitoring results. As part of the renewal process, RIDE provided initial renewal tier designations, based off the two most recent years of available data, to inform the renewal process. The final tier designation is updated based on results from the 2017-18 school year.

The Hope Academy initially received a "No Tier" designation; not enough data was available to determine a tier. The tier assignment process requires two years of available academic, financial, organizational and compliance information. The Hope Academy does not yet have two years of academic data available; the school did not have tested grades and academic results until the end of the 2017-18 school year. The Hope Academy followed an indepth renewal process. The renewal site visit was conducted over a three-day period in early May. To prepare for the site visit, the team, comprised of RIDE staff from the Office of College and Career Readiness, reviewed the charter's performance reports to date, the charter's renewal application, and programmatic and organizational documentation submitted by the school. The site visit consisted of classroom observations and interviews with the charter school board, all members of the school's leadership team, teachers, parents, and students representing all grade levels. The site visit is an integral part of the team's ability to corroborate information provided by the charter school, follow up on areas of the school's operations and ensure the team has gathered information to help determine performance ratings for the Organizational and Compliance Indicators.

This renewal process is The Hope Academy's first charter renewal. The school was authorized to operate in 2014 as a single charter, to serve grades Kindergarten through 8. The Hope Academy is currently serving grades K-3, adding one grade per year. This year will be the school's first year in which students will be participating in the statewide assessment. As such, one year's academic data and three years of organizational and financial data is considered in the renewal recommendation.



#### **CHARTER OVERVIEW**

The Hope Academy is a mayoral academy that currently serves grades Kindergarten through 3. Mayoral academies are schools created by a mayor of any city or town within the state of Rhode Island, acting by or through a nonprofit organization. As such, the chair of The Hope Academy's board of directors is the mayor of North Providence, appointed at the time of the school's inception. A representative for the Mayor of Providence is also an active board member. The school is authorized to serve grades Kindergarten through 8, with a total of 324 students and has grown by one grade level each year, starting with Kindergarten in 2014. The school is also colocated with Meeting Street, a private educational institution that empowers children and their families to thrive through the development of the whole child. The Hope Academy purchases some services from Meeting Street.

The mission of Hope Academy is to commit "to an educational model focusing on the academic and social success of each individual, preparing students to meet the challenges of secondary education and to become lifelong learners. Working with parents and community partners, The Hope Academy will serve as a local and national replicable model of inclusive education."

#### **Enrollment Demographic Information**

Descriptive demographics are based on October enrollment data reported to RIDE by the charter school and reported publicly on InfoWorks.

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Total Enrollment	39	73	112	143
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligibility	44%	43%	61%	55%
Students Receiving Special Education Services	0%	4%	7%	17%
Students Receiving ESL Services	6%	4%	2%	16%
Multiracial	0%	4%	5%	2%
African-American	22%	15%	17%	17%
Latino/Hispanic	39%	58%	58%	59%
Native American	0%	1%	1%	1%
Asian	8%	3%	2%	1%
White/Caucasian	31%	18%	18%	20%



#### **PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW**

The Hope Academy received a "Tier 3" final tier designation for the renewal process due to organizational performance. The Hope Academy initially received a "No Tier" designation given that the school does not have two years of academic data available and only has academic results available, from their first tested grade, at the end of 2017-18. The Hope Academy followed the in-depth renewal process.

In school years 2015-16 and 2016-17, the school did not have tested grades, and a school performance rating could not be determined. In 2017-18 the school met expectations in academic performance. In all school years, the charter met expectations for financial performance. The school received a "meets" overall rating in all years with the exception of organizational performance related equity and access in 2017-18. Additional context for each indicator and criteria rating is included in this report.

Each indicator's specific criteria ratings inform an overall indicator rating. Each charter receives a detailed annual performance report that identifies ratings for each individual criteria and overall indicators. These performance reports accompany the renewal report.

	Indicators	SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Academic	(1A) School Performance	NR	NR	NR	М
Acad	(1B) School Comparison	-	NR	NR	М
oility	(1) Financial	-	М	М	М
Sustainability	(2) Organizational	-	М	М	А
Sust	(3) Compliance	-	М	М	М
Renewal Process Tier		No ·	Tier. In-Depth Rene	ewal Process	
Updated Tier Designation			Tier 3 (Organiza	tional)	

Ratings Key				
E	Exceeds Expectations	DNM	Does Not Meet Expectations	
M	Meets Expectations	NR	Not Rated	
Α	Approaches Expectations	NA	Not Applicable	



#### PRIMARY INDICATOR: ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

School Performance				
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	
Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Meets Expectations	

**Summary**: Academic data is not available for the 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. School year 2014-15 was the first year of the school's operation, during which the school only served Kindergarten, a grade that does not participate in the standardized assessment. In academic year 2017-18, the school grew into grade three, the first tested grade. Therefore, the accountability results for academic year 2017-18 will be the academic performance measure under consideration for the renewal.

In the 2017-18 school year, the school earned three-stars on the statewide accountability system due to academic achievement. The school did not have enough data available to calculate the academic growth measure or English language learner progress in the statewide accountability system.

Through review of documents, the charter's renewal application, and on-site interviews, there is evidence that the school utilizes internal academic data to evaluate its student achievement. The literacy and math coach convene each marking period to synthesize data and determine trends across classrooms. Teachers are then coached, based on the established trends, to differentiate instruction according to the needs of each classroom. Given that students have yet to participate in state assessments, the school relies on internal assessments as data sources for student achievement. Examples of internal assessments include, F&P testing for literacy, Frontline Math, Eureka Math Modular Assessments and daily exit tickets.

School Comparison				
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	
Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	

This sub-indicator is only rated if the results of the 2017-18 school year approached or did not meet expectations in School Performance.



#### SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 1

Financial Performance			
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Not Rated	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations

#### Summary

The charter received an overall "Meets Expectations" annual rating in Financial Performance for each year of its term. Financial ratings are based primarily on the charter's audit and therefore, financial information lags a year. For example, financial ratings for 2015-16 are based on the charter's FY15 audit. Due to the transition of the charter performance review system, the 2014-15 school year is not rated.

The charter school employs a business manager, operations manager and an external accounting firm. The financial committee works in conjunction with the business manager to determine budget revisions. The financial committee, along with the business manager, are responsible for regular updates to the board of trustees on the fiscal health of the organization and bringing issues or recommendations forward. The business and operations manager work in conjunction to ensure that the school's operational needs are met while maintaining prudent financial oversight in coordination with the board's finance committee. Additional information regarding financial management can be found in the Compliance Indicator standards 3.20-3.28.

In the event of an unforeseen expense, the business manager and school leader are responsible for presenting budget revisions to the board of directors. The business manager is responsible for presenting budget to actual each month. As a result, the organization operates under a conservative budgeting and is financially stable.

1.1 Current Ratio	The charter met expectations each year.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	The charter received a rating of "Approaches Expectations" in academic years 2015-16 and 2016-17. The school had 19.82 unrestricted days of cash in AY 2015-16 and 29.35 days of cash in AY 2016-17, below the threshold for meeting expectations in this criterion. In AY 2017-18, the school had 68.89 unrestricted days of cash, and met the threshold for meeting expectations in this criterion. During the on-site interview, the business manager expressed a clear strategy for addressing unforeseen expenses should they arise.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	The charter met expectations each year.
1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	The charter met expectations each year.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	2016-17 is the first year that this criterion could be calculated. This measure is not applicable as the charter does not have principal or interest payments.



### **SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 2**

Organizational Performance				
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	
Not Rated	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	
2015-16 and 2016-17. In	ngs and each criteria of this inc 2017-18 criteria 2.3 was rated s." Due to the transition of the	d "Approaches," resulting in	an overall annual rating of	
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	School-specific goals were not	established over the course	of this term.	
2.2 School Environment	The charter met or exceeded of charter received an "Exceeds 2017-18.  The school's attendance rate 2016-17 and the charter's as elementary average of 94.62% 18 was 95.09%, greater that retention also meets expectat school each year. Demand consistently comprised over 5. The Hope Academy Parent As and overall school involveme foster community and collaborate Classroom Dojo, an online behavioral progress. Classroom copy. Similarly, monthly who Families are involved in the sciparticipating in the interview membership. During the on-sic confirmed that since family of there has been significant imp	is part of the performance attendance rate was 95.21%. The charter's attendance rate in the state elementary avions with over 80% of studentors are stated and of available seats.  Sociation (HAPA) drives parent. HAPA oversees all events oration between families and e application, to update family the school updates are provided to environment in a range process for teachers and admitted interview with the board of engagement became a prior	system for the first time in %, greater than the state ate for academic year 2017-yerage of 94.58%. Student ats choosing to return to the dist the school's waitlist has ent communication, events and activities designed to a school life. Many teachers allies on daily academic and applicates via e-mail and hard ded by the Head of School. of different capacities, from ministrators, to active board of directors, board members ity for The Hope Academy,	



	Use of attrition data and applicant pool composition were not a factor of this criterion until the 16-17 school year. There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making. The charter met expectations for attrition rates in 2016-17 and 2017-18. The school implements a withdrawal process to track attrition and ensure that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations.
2.3 Equity and Access	There is not evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. During onsite interviews, school leadership expressed that the existing recruitment policy is not implemented. The Hope Academy did recruit from daycares and other educational institutions at the school's inception, yet no longer actively recruits students. 17 students from North Providence applied to the school in the 2017-18 lottery, compared to 213 Providence student applications. Similarly, the school's 2016-17 applicant pool consisted of 10 North Providence residents compared to 134 Providence applicants. In academic year 2017-18, 9 students residing in North Providence attended The Hope Academy, compromising 6% of the student population.
2.4 Dissemination	The 2016-17 school year is the first year this criterion was evaluated. The charter met expectations in 2016-17 and 2017-18. The School Adjustment Counselor is the shepherd for the school's dissemination efforts. The Adjustment Counselor has presented at Rhode Island College and Providence college, and at The Grace School. The Adjustment Counselor also shares best practices for a de-escalation strategy called "Go to the Beach." The Hope Academy team plans to apply for a grant funding to develop the strategy and share with other schools. Teachers participate in professional development with Grace School teachers and share best practices on the behavior management system.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	The charter met expectations in 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18. Their board and school leaders engage in strategic and continuous improvement by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to student academic success, priorities that are aligned to the school's mission and educational philosophy. The board currently has eleven voting members. Four of the eleven members are parents of Hope Academy students and are Mayors (or appointed representatives) of Providence and North Providence. The board operates committees (finance, evaluation and school improvement) that include board members and the school improvement team. The board oversees student academic achievement through the monitoring of goals established by the school improvement team. No board member is part of the school improvement team; a teacher and parent co-chairs the team. The goals for the head of school are another mechanism in which the board monitors student achievement. Board minutes and interviews confirm that the head of school presents student academic achievement data to the board aligned to her stated goals.



The board and school leaders have implemented clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. The head of school and superintendent manage the day-to-day operations, while policies and financial oversight are reviewed and confirmed by the board. Under the advisement of the superintendent, the head of school makes most school-based decisions. In the event of the absence of the head of school, the superintendent, also the Director of School-Aged Programs of Meeting Street, steps in as the decision maker. The Hope Academy contracts with the superintendent through an annual stipend. Some Hope Academy services are contracted out to Meeting Street, a physical therapist, for example. There are records of hours billed for the services, finances and budgets do not intermingle between the two organizations. The chairperson of The Hope Academy board is the Mayor of North Providence. According to The Hope Academy board bylaws and on-site interviews, any board member employed by Meeting Street recuse themselves when decisions are made related to the school's involvement with Meeting Street.

There is evidence that the board holds the school leader accountable. The evaluation committee facilitates the evaluation for the superintendent each year. The committee convenes formally twice a year, in the fall and summer, reviewing the evaluation from the previous year and creating the evaluation for the upcoming year.

#### Sustainability Indicator 3

Compliance					
SY14-15	SY14-15 SY15-16 SY16-17 SY17-18				
Not Rated	Meets Expectations Meets Expect		Meets Expectations		
Summary: Due to the transition of the charter performance review system, the 2014-15 school year is not rated. In 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18 the charter met expectations in all related criteria.  Over the course of the term, the charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with student rights, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for monitoring civil rights, special education, English learners, and Title 1. The charter has					
(3.1 - 3.5)	submitted the charter school applicant report each year and its lottery process was monitored in the 2017-18 school year.				
Employee	The charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with employee management to the various RIDE offices responsible for certification and educator				



Management (3.6 - 3.8)	evaluation. Human resources procedures are documented in the employee handbook. The Operations Manager oversees the complaint policy outlined in the handbook.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	The charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with health and safety, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for school health services and food service. The student handbook includes a code of conduct, health and safety procedures.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	The charter met expectations in each criteria associated with Educational Program. All essential educational program components were provided through renewal document submission. Curricular resources were provided on-site and through document submission. The resources are aligned to state standards in each core content area. The charter has submitted all required information via statewide data reporting tools including but not limited to TCS, enrollment and attendance.
	The charter's school calendar complies with the required length of school day and year.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	The charter met expectations in each of the criteria associated with school leadership. The board's bylaws were updated in January 2018. The bylaws include a clear conflict of interest policy that also exists for employees. The board files its meeting agendas with the Secretary of State and meetings are open to the public as required by state law.
	The charter met expectations in each of the criteria associated with financial management. The charter complied with all required financial reporting.
Financial	The operations manager works to support the business manager with completion of purchase orders, completing payroll information, setting school transportation, among other duties. The business manager, a part-time employee, oversees the organization's finance and accounting. While the operations manager completes purchase orders by paying invoices, the business manager balances the budget. The business and operations manager have clear and well-understood systems for financial oversight.
Management (3.20 - 3.28)	The Hope Academy contracts with Meeting Street, the co-located private school, for some professional services. When the school opened the need for contracted professional services was greater; the school currently only contracts with Meeting Street for physical therapy and speech services. To ensure a clear and transparent system for payment, Meeting Street issues an invoice for the professional services, the business manager then reviews and issues payment. The school provided evidence of tracked hours and invoices. The school has entered a facilities lease with Meeting Street. The lease is a flat fee each month and includes custodial, utilities, use of common areas, and receptionist. The board of directors and finance committee hired a pro bono attorney to advise on entering the lease and review the lease terms and conditions.



Dear Members of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education:

I am writing in response to our charter renewal report that was recently received from the Commissioner's Office on December 18, 2018.

The mission of The Hope Academy is to create a school that is focused on the academic and social success of each individual student. We are committed to becoming a national model for inclusive education. The Hope Academy is proud of the work that we have accomplished at reaching these goals during our first four years. Some of our greatest accomplishments include:

- Establishing a fully-inclusive school for students from Providence and North Providence
- Creating a student-centered approach to addressing social and emotional needs
- Implementation of research-based, rigorous curriculum in all subject areas; included socio-emotional
- Providing a variety of enrichment and intervention opportunities for all students; included a Saturday "Arts & Smarts" program, a "Rockin' RICAS afterschool program, and a "Community of Learners" student orientation session
- Creating a four-week summer enrichment program to provides extended learning opportunities for students to engage in project based STEM learning activities
- Establishing and maintaining a fiscally sound hiring process that supports the fully-inclusive instructional model

One challenge that was noted by the renewal team was related to the process in which The Hope Academy actively recruits families and students from both of our sending districts. Our current policy states:

"Marketing outreach will extend beyond traditional approaches, such as ads in local newspapers, social media, and web based marking to reach families that are considered hard to reach. Strategies will include disseminating information through area churches, child care centers, local businesses, etc. All material will be provided in both English and Spanish."

The Hope Academy has been in the practice of reaching out and recruiting students from both sending districts. During the 2017 lottery we had 230 applications for a total of 27 seats. Of those applications, there were 17 applications from families from North Providence and 213 from Providence. While this may seem disproportionate, it should be noted that the number of applications originating from North Providence represents 7% of the total applications. This reflects a similar ratio of students currently attending school within our sending districts; North Providence represents 13% of the total student populations from these two school districts.



The Hope Academy has utilized the following recruiting methods: posting our application on our school website, sharing an informational flyer with families who attend the Universal State Pre-K program and the private preschool program located at Meeting Street, and posting information on The Hope Academy Parent Association Facebook page.

The Hope Academy has already begun the process of addressing this concern. The following additional recruitment steps will be taken prior to our March 1, 2019 open lottery:

- An informational ad will be published in the newspaper; such as the Valley Breeze
- School representatives will visit some local child care centers in both Providence and North Providence to disseminate information pertaining to our lottery

The Hope Academy is committed to providing a fully-inclusive learning environment for all students. We appreciate the support and advice provided to us throughout this renewal process and we are grateful for the opportunity to continue this work together.

Sincerely,

Angela Holt Head of School



### **Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Not Rated		The school did not receive a composite index score because it does not have tested grades for the statewide accountability system. The first tested grade will be third grade in 2017-2018. RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2015-2016.

### **Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Not Rated		Academic Performance: School Comparison is only rated when a school receives a rating of "Approaches" or "Does Not Meet" for the Academic Performance: School Performance Annual Rating.

### **Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	Criterion 1.2 is rated as "Approaches Expectations" and all other criteria are rated as "Meets Expectations"
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio was 1.14.
1.2 Unrestricted Days	Approaches	School has between 15 and 30	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 19.82.



of Cash	Expectations	days of unrestricted cash or School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is negative.	
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.88.
1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Meets Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The school only has two years of financial data. The most recent year's total margin was 0.01.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		Debt Service Coverage Ratio will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.

### **Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		RIDE did not establish school specific goals in academic year



			2015-16.
2.2 School Environment	Meets Expectations	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE.  AND There is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families. AND at least 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year.	Family engagement: The school provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Student attendance rate and student retention will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is	Recruitment & Lottery: No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle.  Use of attrition data & applicant pool composition will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.



2.4 Dissemination	Not Rated	representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	Dissemination efforts will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	Meets Expectations	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes.  AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: The school provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication: The school provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Board Holds School Leader Accountable: The school provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.



### **Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance**

Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criteria not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. IDEA: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. Title III (English Language Learners): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation,	<b>Educator Certification:</b> A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues.



(3.6 - 3.8)		rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	HR Procedures: The school provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Facility Assurances: Facility Assurances will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.  School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report.  Food Service: Food Service will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.  Behavior & Safety Policies: The school provided evidence of behavior and safety policies in the Annual School Health Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Educational Program: The school provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Curriculum Standards: The school provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting.  School Day/Length Policy: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report for the Charter office.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation,	Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual



		rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Report.  Board Bylaws: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: School complied with budget submissions.  Quarterly Financial Reporting: School complied with Quarterly financial reports.  UCOA Reporting: School complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit.  Annual Financial Audit: The school's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses.  Single Audit: N/A



### **Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Not Rated		The school did not receive a composite index score because it does not have tested grades for the statewide accountability system. The first tested grade will be third grade in 2017-2018. RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2016-17.

### **Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Not Rated		Academic Performance: School Comparison is only rated when a school receives a rating of "Approaches" or "Does Not Meet" for the Academic Performance: School Performance Annual Rating.

#### **Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations" with the exception of 1.2 which is rated "Approaches Expectations."  Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2016-17, the ratings reflect the information in the FY16 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio was 1.16.



1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	Approaches Expectations	School has between 15 and 30 days of unrestricted cash OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is negative	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 29.35.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.86.
1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Meets Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was .0102. The three year aggregate margin was 0.01.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		The debt service coverage ratio is not rated. The charter did not have principal and interest payment in FY16.

### **Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2016-17.



2.2 School Environment	Exceeds Expectations	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE. AND There is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families. AND At least 80% of students in non-break grades* return to school the next year. AND The school's waitlist comprises at least 50% of available seats for the current school year.	Student Attendance: The school's attendance rate was 95.21%, greater than the elementary school state average of 94.62%  Family engagement: The charter provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Student Retention: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.  Waitlist: The school's waitlist comprises more than 50% of seats available.
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	Attrition Data: The charter provided assurances of attrition data analysis in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Recruitment & Lottery: No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle.  Applicant Pool: The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2017 lottery shows applicants from Providence and North Providence.



2.4 Dissemination	Meets Expectations	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	Sharing and Partnership: The charter provided assurances and descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	Meets Expectations	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: The charter provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication: The charter provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report.  Board Holds School Leader Accountable: The charter provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.

### **Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance**

	School Rating Detail	Rubric Rating Description	School's Rating	Indicator / Criteria
--	----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	----------------------



Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.  IDEA: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.  English Language Learners: No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support.  Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.  Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Educator Certification: A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues.  HR Procedures: The charter provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.



Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Facility Documentation & Assurances: The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the National School Lunch Program Annual School Health Report.  Food Service: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the National School Lunch Program and the RI Nutritional Requirements.  Behavior & Safety Policies: The charter provided assurances of behavior and safety policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Educational Program: The charter provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Curriculum Standards: The charter provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting.  School Day/Length Policy: The charter school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Board Bylaws: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.  Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared



			Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: The charter complied with budget submissions.  Quarterly Financial Reporting: The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports.  UCOA Reporting: The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit.  Annual Financial Audit: The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses.  Single Audit: N/A



### **Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	1.A.1 is rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds" and 1.A.2 is rated as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's star rating was 3-stars and the school did not set school specific goals in 2017-18.

### **Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Not Rated		Academic Performance: School Comparison is only rated when a school receives a rating of "Approaches" or "Does Not Meet" for the Academic Performance: School Performance Annual Rating.

### **Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations" with the exception of 1.2 which is rated "Approaches Expectations."  Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2017-18, the ratings reflect the information in the FY17 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	Meets Expectations	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio was 3.82.



1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	Meets Expectations	School has between 15 and 30 days of unrestricted cash OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is negative	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 68.89.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	Meets Expectations	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.26.
1.4 Total Margin & 3- Year Aggregate Total Margin	Meets Expectations	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.14. The three year aggregate margin was 0.07.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Not Rated		The debt service coverage ratio is not rated. The charter did not have principal and interest payments in FY17.

### **Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Approaches Expectations	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Does Not Meet" and all others are rated as "Approaches", "Meets" or "Exceeds."	Criterion 2.3 was rated as "Approaches Expectations." All other criteria in this indicator have been rated "Exceeds Expectations" or "Meets Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	Not Rated		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2017-18.



2.2 School Environment	Exceeds Expectations	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE. AND There is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families. AND At least 80% of students in non-break grades* return to school the next year. AND The school's waitlist comprises at least 50% of available seats for the current school year.	Student Attendance: The school's attendance rate was 95.09%, greater than the elementary school state average of 94.58%  Family engagement: The charter provided evidence of family engagement in renewal document submission and during on-site interviews.  Student Retention: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.  Waitlist: The school's waitlist comprises more than 50% of seats available.
2.3 Equity and Access	Approaches Expectations	Evidence suggests that the school has not implemented recruitment, enrollment and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district.	Attrition Data: The charter provided evidence of attrition data analysis in the renewal document submissions and on-site interviews.  Recruitment & Lottery: No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was conducted for this review cycle.  Applicant Pool: The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2018 lottery shows 7% of the applicant pool consisted of applicants residing in North Providence. On-site interviews confirm that the school does not implement its current recruitment policy.
2.4 Dissemination	Meets Expectations	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	Sharing Quality Best Practice: The charter provided evidence and descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice. The School Adjustment Counselor is the shepherd for the school's dissemination efforts. The Adjustment Counselor has presented at Rhode Island College and Providence college, and at The Grace School. The Adjustment Counselor also shares best practices for a de-escalation strategy called "Go to the Beach." The Hope



			Academy team plans to apply for a grant funding to develop the strategy and share with other schools.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	Meets Expectations	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement: The charter provided evidence of continuous improvement activities during the on-site interview.  Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication: The charter provided evidence of decision making and communication systems during the on-site interview.  Board Holds School Leader Accountable: The charter provided evidence of holding school leader(s) accountable in renewal document submission and during on-site interviews.

### **Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance**

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	Meets Expectations	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."



		Meet."	
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<ul> <li>3.1: Office for Civil Rights: No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.</li> <li>3.2: IDEA: A formal review was conducted, and no outstanding issues were identified.</li> <li>3.3: English Language Learners: No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support.</li> <li>3.4: Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.</li> <li>3.5: Enrollment Procedures: The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery. The March 1, 2018 lottery was monitored.</li> </ul>
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<ul> <li>3.6: Educator Certification: A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues.</li> <li>3.7: HR Procedures: The charter provided evidence of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their renewal document submissions.</li> <li>3.8: Educator Evaluation: A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.</li> </ul>
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<ul> <li>3.9: Facility Documentation &amp; Assurances: The charter provided evidence of facilities inspections and documentation in their renewal document submissions.</li> <li>3.10: School Health Services: No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report.</li> </ul>



			3.11: Food Service: No outstanding issues were identified in the National School Lunch Program and the RI Nutritional Requirements. Per agency practice a formal was not conducted. 3.12: Behavior & Safety Policies: The charter provided evidence of behavior and safety policies in their renewal document submissions.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<ul> <li>3.13: Educational Program: The charter provided evidence of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their renewal document submissions and on-site.</li> <li>3.14: Curriculum Standards: The charter provided evidence that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their renewal document submissions and on-site.</li> <li>3.15: Data Reporting: No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting.</li> <li>3.16: School Day/Length Policy: The charter school provided evidence of these policies in their renewal document submissions.</li> </ul>
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<ul> <li>3.17: Open Meetings and Ethics Policy: The charter provided evidence of these policies in renewal document submissions.</li> <li>3.18: Board Bylaws: The charter provided evidence of these policies in their renewal document submissions.</li> <li>3.19: Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management: The charter provided evidence of these policies in their renewal document submissions.</li> </ul>
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance	<ul> <li>3.20: Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions: The charter complied with budget submissions.</li> <li>3.21: Quarterly Financial Reporting: The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports.</li> </ul>



		3.22-3.23: UCOA Reporting: The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. 3.24-3.27: Annual Financial Audit: The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. 3.28: Single Audit: N/A
--	--	--